

NUMBER 18.

Copyright © 2012 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. *J. Forecast.* **32**, 1–16 (2013) DOI: 10.1002/for

any triumph, which is highly becoming and every way worthy of them. It is that of **GENERAL ILLUMINATION**! Now a whig illumination will certainly be a spectacle worth beholding. We believe it is unprecedented in the history of our country. Certainly our late war, with all its victories, on lakes and oceans, over our foreign foe, never elicited an illumination on this school of politicians. Blue lights we can remember something about, but these were not burnt exactly by way of patriotic exultation, unless our memory has failed us. But the present is a greater occasion; a splendid victory has been obtained over one half of the American people by the other half; the glorious cause of exclusive privilege has triumphed; in word, "*rags has riz, and gold is fell*," and we must needs have an illumination.—*N. Y. New Era.*

From the Eastern Argus.
AN ADMISSION.

Certain federal papers (after laboring in vain to prove that they are not federal,) have at length set about proving that if they are so, the fact will not operate as a disqualification with that party which would like to be known as "whigs." The Journal of Commerce says "the great body of the whigs are decidedly against all these narrow notions," and to prove its assertion refers to the fact that the true blue, unadulterated Hartford Convention federalists, like David B. Ogden, who were on the "whig" ticket at the late election in New York, received as many votes, as those candidates who have never confessed their federalism, but have been known under other names. This fact proves the Journal's position, & it proves just as conclusively, what we have always asserted, that the old federal party and the modern "whig" party, are one and the same—at any rate, we find one of the leading journals of the latter asserting and proving that to have belonged to the former is no disqualification. A federal paper in this city, the Courier, copies and endorses the Journal's article, and says:—

"It cannot be supposed that to him who has come upon the stage of action since the old federal and democratic party, down to which defect he owes his candidate for office once belonged."

Play when did the "old divisions become defunct?" Upon the principle that it takes two to make a bargain, they have not yet "become defunct." The federalists have endeavored to shake off their name, but not so the democrats—the latter have, and will continue to stick for old names and old tests. We are not to be inveigled to sea without compass, chart or rudder—we think it better to go by the old soundings, and steer by the old lights. The great questions upon which the country is divided now, involve the same principles with those which divided it years ago, when the federalists were proud of their name, and the democrats, as now, were proud of theirs. Why then should we consent to a change of names?

The Portsmouth Journal, which has been a modern "whig" paper in good standing, advances the same doctrine with the Journal of Commerce. It welcomes into the ranks of its party, "every man who is tired of experiments," and says:—

"It will not be worth while to enquire whether his grandfather wore a cocked hat or a round one—whether his father voted for Jefferson or Adams, nor whether he himself believed gun-boats to be the best navy, or signed his name to a Washington Benevolent Society, AND STOOD UP FOR THE HARTFORD CONVENTION."

Neither of the papers give even an intimation that any change of principles is essential to qualify an advocate of the Hartford Convention to become a member of the party. It is a communion without any evidence of "a change of heart." Why, then, should these self-styled "whigs" object to being called by their true name of federalists?—simply because it has become odious—for the same reason that a rogue fancies an alias. Let those grailly the whom the federalists who will, we will not, and we venture to suggest to our democratic brethren throughout the State, the policy and propriety of adhering to old names and old tests. We are not willing to fellowship, politically, with a Hartford Convention federalist, until he has changed his principles, and sincerely repented of his past deeds—the mis-called "whigs" say they are, and for our own part we see no good reason why they should not be—for them to turn up their noses at federalism, would be like the arms and legs rebelling against the body from which they derive their strength.

From the Eastern Argus.
THE LATE BANK CONVENTION, &c.

The proceedings of the late Bank Convention have given very little satisfaction to the community generally. The feeling is almost universal that it was the duty, and within the power, of that Convention, to have fixed upon a day for resumption. The convention is irresistible that the postponement was a political measure, dictated by Mr. Biddle, and intended to operate in favor of the Institution over which he presides. It is the determination of the federal leaders, if possible, to stave off the resumption so that the continuance of an irredeemable currency may be brought to bear upon the next elections—let them beware that they do not overstep the mark! Among the people, without distinction of party, there is a feeling that it is the duty of the Banks to resume at an early day in the spring, and that if they do not fulfil that duty they will cease to have a claim to any further forbearance.

The reader will see by the facts set forth in the following article from the New York Herald of the 8th inst., that the state of the foreign exchanges is such as to enable the banks, (if they have been judiciously conducted,) to resume forthwith—that a National Bank is not necessary to regulate or facilitate exchanges—and that the Philadelphia, Baltimore and Boston Banks oppose a resumption for a "consideration."

"The equalizing movement in the foreign exchanges continued to-day till the very last moment. We are credibly informed that a few parcels went as low as 111, calculating in bank money, which is nearly equivalent to 3 per cent under the real par of exchange between New York and Liverpool. The same process continues in domestic exchanges. To-day exchange on New Orleans was sold for 1 1-2 to 1 3-4 premium—on Charleston, 1 1-2—and on Mobile 5. This remarkable fact is now developed of an equalization almost in the

southern exchanges without the aid or intervention of a National Bank. Indeed, it is confidently stated, that if the course of commercial events continue, exchanges between New York and New Orleans will fall to par in a short time—a thing unprecedented and unknown in the commercial history of this country.

Conclusions, from these facts, may be drawn, of great importance to financial science. They prove that the elements of commerce control the exchanges—not the factitious rules of a board of directors or the existence of a national bank. Cotton, and cotton alone, is the principle element of phenomenon. The amount of capital to purchase cotton has been flowing towards the south, while the south has given New York few orders for goods.

But while this continues to be the healthy action of the commercial circle, formed of Liverpool, New York and New Orleans, the state of the exchanges between New York and the neighboring Atlantic cities is unnatural and high. Exchange on Baltimore is 2 per cent—on Philadelphia 1 3-4, on Boston 2 to 2 1-2. This arises from the fact that the balances, due by those three cities to New York, are estimated at \$5,000,000. This amount capital in the hands of New York, while New York is deprived of her just rights. To this circumstance is also to be attributed the opposition to the resumption of specie payments, by Baltimore, Boston and Philadelphia in the Bank Convention. As long as the present state of dishonor continues among the Banks, New York cannot call in her bank balances, nor charge interest. Under our own State suspension law, the western banks agreed to pay 4 to 5 per cent interest for all balances accumulating here after a certain date. This had the effect to keep down those balances—but with Boston, Philadelphia and Baltimore, the suspension leaves us entirely in their power. The motives which influence the refusal of these banks to name a day for resumption, become therefore, very plain and very obvious.

Appropos of the Bank Convention—We perceive that Maine was represented by Ashur Ware and Joseph C. Noyes, the federal representative in Congress from Hancock and Washington. Were the latter gentleman's credentials called for? Had he any? Judge Ware was the only delegate chosen by the State Convention—Mr. Noyes was there as a political delegate from the U. S. Bank party—Judge Ware, it is understood, was in favor of fixing on a day for resumption, Mr. Noyes opposed! We do not hesitate to say that the latter was influenced by political considerations alone—he could have had no other reasons, for the Bank with which he is connected at Eastport, and which, it is presumed, he claimed the right to represent, has never suspended specie payments. And yet one of its directors, to answer a political end, voted to fasten upon this emergency. Let his constituents remember this—let them not forget that he went, an interloper, into the Bank Convention, and there voted against a resolution requiring those Institutions to pay their debts, to become honest, and that too after the Banks of this State had instructed their only duly elected representative to vote for the earliest practicable day. Let these things be remembered.

The Message is assailed by the opposition press in the city of New York, in terms of wholesale denunciation: Save the Journal of Commerce, it is denounced in toto, and without reservation or qualification. If they are to be credited, not a word of it is said, nor a suggestion rightly made. It is denounced, at once, as non-committal, and as committed in the strongest terms—as tame and subdued, and as fierce and uncompromising—as succumbing to the Conservatives, and as imbued with loco-focoism—as "timid, cowering and wavering," and as breaching war, and "echoing the coarse calumnies of the Globe."

If any thing can be required to satisfy republicans of the truth and the strong grounds of the Message—and of the sincerity with which the President has presented his views to the consideration of Congress and for the judgment of the people—it is this indiscriminate and wholesale war upon it and upon him in federal quarters. But the most senseless and ideal of the charges against the Message is that of loco-focoism. The unscrupulous New York Express exclaims, "Well Martin Van Buren is a loco-foco yet!" and the Albany Daily Advertiser, thinks that "few who have considered Mr. Van Buren's position will be disappointed at the general features of loco-focoism which pervade the Message."

The meaning and scope of "Loco Focoism," in the federal acceptance of the word, we shall take another occasion to illustrate. Meanwhile we do not believe that a single American citizen has risen from the perusal of that document with the belief, or with the remotest thought, that it was imbued with loco-focoism, in any particular or in its "general features." Nor do we believe that the thought would occur to any one, unless it were suggested by sinister malice or partisan hostility. Wherein do the "general features of loco-focoism pervade the message?" Are they to be found in its opening paragraph,—"the renewal of an expression of gratitude to the Giver of all Good for His benevolent protection and for the continued dispensations of His favor upon our beloved country? Are they to be found in its well-considered and impartial review of the fortunate condition of our foreign relations—in its succinct statement of the condition of the national finances—in its business notices of the army, the navy, the military academy, and the general post office? Are they to be found in its clear and just recommendations in

relations to the classification and graduation of the prices of the public lands and the protection of the rights of the actual settler? Are they to be found in its calm, moderate and conciliatory view of the question of a disconnection between the banks and the government; in its language of deference for the opinions of others; or in its free submission, under a firm conviction of the soundness of its suggestions, to the national will, as "the supreme law of the republic?" Are they to be found in its disclaimer of hostility to the State banks; or in its exposure of the fraudulent issue by the present Bank of the United States, of the irredeemable notes of a defunct institution, acting in the capacity of trustee, but in violation of every obligation as such, and of every duty to the public and to the government?

But we will not question the intelligence of the people of this country so much as to pursue the interrogatory, or to imagine for a moment that a device so stale and groundless can deceive them, in any degree, or that the patriotic and thinking electors of our republic can be drawn away from a just and rational support of the administration by imputations which so many of our readers have since their origin.

OXFORD DEMOCRAT.
Paris, December 19, 1857.

The success of the federal party has emboldened them in many instances to an avowal of their sentiments and principles which we regret to see. We regret it at it because it will have a tendency to raise up the spirit of democracy when they are once convinced that their old foe is in the field—that the federalism of by-gone days is creeping out of the holes and lurking place where it had sought to shelter from the around indignation of the people. The election of Mr. Adams to the Presidency was hailed as auspicious to the resurrection of federalism, and one of the leaders of that defunct party proclaimed that those who fell in the first Adams were to rise with the second. But the people caught the alarm and their hopes were crushed. Now in their hour of success and fancied victory some are throwing off the mask and proclaiming their hopes of the restoration of the principles of Adams and Hamilton. The patriot, Jefferson, whom the people have been taught to esteem and admire—and whose reputation is enshrined in the hearts of the democracy of the country, is now attacked with the vilest abuse by those who a little year ago dared not to whisper a thought injurious to his character. Some may enquire why the assaurs of the dead are thus raked upon; why the sanctity of the grave is invaded by political scribbles? The answer is plain. The writings of Jefferson have become a sort of political text book to the democracy of the country, and they have exerted and continue to exert an influence over the minds of the people dangerous if not fatal to the success of federalism. It is perhaps found more convenient or less difficult to attack his character than his positions and arguments. At any rate they appear to think that if his character can be destroyed in the estimation of the people, his principles and precepts will possess less influence. The plan is a bold one but we have no fears of its success. When the organs of the present administration have written down Jefferson, they will doubtless write up Adams, Hamilton and Ains.

When the people have learned to despise the former, they may easily be taught to venerate the principles and doctrines of the latter—but not till then. We are spared further remarks on this subject, by the several able articles which our readers will find in this days paper, and to which we invite their attention. Mr. Webster in one of his late speeches declared that there was but one question before the country and that question has but two sides. It follows, then, that there can be but two parties, and each man must belong to one or the other of these parties. That question is Bank or no Bank. We are glad to have that question so precisely put. The people can understand it. We trust that most of them have their minds made up. The time will soon come when we shall be called upon to act—Will you be governed by a National Bank or by such rulers as the people may select? This is a question that you are called upon to decide, not merely for yourselves but for your children, and for posterity. If you sell yourselves and your liberty to a Bank, there can be no redemption but through blood—if you put with the power of self government it cannot be regained except by a revolution. It will never be taken back to the aristocracy of wealth. You will always have the power of prostituting that power so long as you retain the administration in your own hands. But if you once give that power to a free government may still be kept, because they may be used to vote the democracy of a despotic claims may be guided, but they will not be the less guiding. Choose then your side of the question now presented by the friends of a National Bank. The wealth of the country, and all whom it can influence or control will be on one side. The democracy of the country will be on the other.

It is stated that the elder Adams when presiding upon his relative, the Patriot, Samuel Adams, the necessity of establishing a nonsectarian government, replied to his enquiry of how he could induce the people to submit to the loss of their liberties, by saying that he would do it by slandering, by reviling and degrading every man who opposed their measures. This idea appears never to have been lost sight of by his followers. No man since that day has been eminent for his devotion to the cause of the people—no man has dared to maintain the democratic doctrines of the capacity of men for self government—of equal rights and privileges, and resistance to all irresponsible power, but what the whole federal press has been loud and vehement in his abuse and unparagoning in their attacks upon his character and reputation. From Jefferson to Van Buren the mode of attack has been the same, and the charges similar if not identical. The principles of democracy are represented as opposed to the order and well being of society—as destructive of national prosperity and happiness. The federalists have always claimed for themselves all the religion and decency, and attempted to slander their opponents as being destitute of both. This mode of attack has not heretofore met with the success which was anticipated for it, but it is still persisted in as though it were the last hope of the aristocracy. As one of their own politicians has said of them, the federalists are too obstinate to learn any thing from past experience, but still go on extending for the exploded doctrines of the darker ages of the world, while the people have been maintaining and enjoying the blessings of freedom and equality. To be is however, something in the scheme above referred to, and its practice has been attended with partial success.

But it can never be completely successful as long as the people are honest and intelligent.

We need not invite the attention of our readers to the President's Message, as we trust that all will peruse it with deep interest. But we do ask for it a careful and attentive consideration. The sentiments it contains, and the doctrines it advocates are such as will command the entire attention of every democrat in the country. There is nothing mysterious or perplexing about it. Every one who reads can understand it. The federalists who consider it their duty to find fault with it, appear to be at a loss on what point to attack it. One says it is too decided, another charges it as being non-committal. Its views are charged with being arbitrary and dictatorial by one, while another finds it full of loose fictions, and containing the essence of radicalism. The truth is, that when men are determined to find fault, objections are easily made. All who are honest and capable of judging will allow the message to be able, frank, and decided. It is to be expected that our opponents should dissent from the doctrines advanced, and endavor to destroy them in the estimation of the people. While this is done in an open and frank manner, we have no objection to it. We have friends here and we presume have no disposition to complain. From such a course we have nothing to fear. We must also expect misrepresentation and abuse. For we presume every democrat is prepared. We are ready to combat the views of the people.

The result of the late Bank Convention we presume has not disappointed the expectations of the people generally. They must have been aware long before this that they had nothing to hope from the Banks—that the object of the convention was political and pecuniary, and that these interests alone would influence their deliberations. Such has been the fact. That portion of the convention who were influenced by pecuniary considerations would have been willing to have fixed upon some future day for the resumption of specie payments, but the politicians would not consent to this. They would not consent to forego the advantages which the Bank party in politics might derive from continuing the pressure another year. They feared to relax their grasp upon their victims, lest their indignation for the past might overcome their fears of the future, and that those who now rode with a red of iron, might find the red hold over their own heads. By the time was supposed that the people had not yet suffered enough—that they were not yet prepared to kiss the red and were ready to be a national Bank. They found that the object intended by the suspension was not yet fully accomplished—and that the independence of the people was not yet fully obtained, then the pressure must be kept on and the screws tightened.

Well be it so. The comedy is in the hands of the people. They may use it or patiently endure whatever their masters may choose to inflict. We do not pretend to know exactly how much the people are disposed to bear in the way of insult and oppression, nor how far their spirits are subdued to submit to the terms prescribed by their money-lending oppressors who are but the creatures of their will. If we were satisfied that a Bank aristocracy was the best form of government, our spirit would still revolt at the means employed to bring it about. Time will show whether the democracy of the country is not of the same opinion.

We find nothing in the Congressional proceedings worthy of particular notice. As yet they have hardly commenced business. Another week we will endeavor to inform our readers what they are about.

READ! PONDER! DECIDE!
Democracy decide, whether you will ever succumb and crouch like beasts at the door to such modern Whig doctrine—such an anti-republican, privileged, despotic system, as is given in the annexed outlines of their political creed.—North Star

From the Boston Advertiser.
WHIG DOCTRINE!
The exploded doctrine of Hamilton, that the people were their worst enemies is again revised since the whig successes in New York. We are now openly told by the ablest federal writers, that the people are incapable of self-government, that the Constitution gives them too much liberty, that suffrage must be restricted, that the President must hold his office independent of popular will, and the two separate Houses of Congress abolished.

These are the principles of the re-constituted federal party, now openly advocated in the New York Commercial, and declared by that paper to be from the pen of one of the highest leaders in the party. It is a fact that a Liberator's article has appeared in the New York Commercial of Monday last, in which the following whig doctrines of the revived federal party are unblushingly maintained, and from which the people may learn what their fate will be if the monarchial party, the modern whigs, ever get the ascendancy.

It is held forth as sound doctrine, to the Commercial—

1. That it is idle to talk of the intelligence of the people, for "the history of nations cannot present an example of such TOTAL WASTE OF INTELLIGENCE as our country now affords."
2. That it is a FUNDAMENTAL MISTAKE that the people MAY BE GOVERNED, or will govern themselves by reason."
3. That "the difficulties in our political affairs are the genuine and natural consequences of defects in the Constitution, and of the FALSE and VISIONARY opinions which Mr. Jefferson and his disciples have been proclaiming for forty years."
4. That universal suffrage has been left without ADEQUATE RESTRICTIONS.
5. That high officers should not be responsible to the people, and the Constitution must be changed in this respect, because "when the Executive officers depend for their offices on annual or frequent elections there will be no impartial or efficient administration of the laws."
6. That "the Constitution must SECURE the Chief Magistrate in his office."
7. These are the whig doctrines of the day, and give that party a National Bank and they will establish just such high tory principles of arbitrary government as these. We are surprised to see the mask off so soon. It was to

have been supposed that the "dear people" would have been flattered a little more before they were told they were too ignorant to govern themselves or to be trusted with the election of their rulers.

The exulting New York whigs of the Ogden and Burr school, have avowed their high government doctrines a little to soon. Mr. Webster has just sent a letter to the Boston Whig editing Committee advising them to do every thing possible to flatter the people—to be sure all committees and managers consult the people most respectfully before they do any thing, and then do as they please, in the midst of this complaisance from Mr. Webster our comes the true federal doctrine that the people are not fit to govern themselves!

FROM CANADA.

A co respondent of the New York Express writes from the "North part of Vermont," under the date of Dec. 4, as follows:—

"The Patriots are rapidly organizing, but they are in great want of arms—by the way, procure them in season for the winter campaign. If the more wealthy of the patriots would raise funds sufficient to purchase five or ten thousand stand of arms, they would easily take possession of all the lower Province, except Quebec, this winter."

From the representations of the writer, the British troops engaged in the operations against St. Dennis and St. Charles, accomplished nothing to boast of.

The Pittsburg Whig of Saturday, Dec. 2, gives an account of the entrance of a royalist Sheriff with three armed men, into the tavern of Mr. Nichols, an American citizen at Champlain. "The British officer enquired if certain men of the Canadian Radical party were there, and upon receiving an indirect answer, proposed searching the house. Mr. N. told him he should not search, when the Sheriff threatened to blow out his brains Mr. Nichols dared him to fire—after which the royal party left the house. The circumstance excited a little burlesque of Yankee indignation. The Burlington (Vt) Sentinel of the 8th inst., says:—'About 40 Canadian gentlemen who had fled from their families in Swanton across the line for fear of being arrested upon the charge of high treason—thinking after the battle of St. Charles and the Proclamation of the Governor, that they would be safe to return their families, started from Swanton with that view. They were attacked at Missisquoi by about 500 loyalists lying in ambush, who had heard of their determination to return home. They killed one man, wounded two, shot one horse, and took one prisoner. The party of Canadians, we understand, upon being attacked retreated across the line."

The St. Albans Journal says:—
The Patriots are organizing their men and preparing for their winter campaign. Little recruiting will be done until there is some prospect of Montreal they are assembled in large numbers and are drilling under the command of a man by the name of Canard and a Swiss officer by the name of Girard. They have the complete command of the country and have stopped the mails. On this side of the St. Lawrence they have retired from St. Denis and are now posted at St. Charles.

All active operations will probably be suspended on both sides until the month of January.
Not the least reference can be placed in the accounts of the battle of St. Charles which are published by the Tory paper of Montreal. We have received information from numbers of persons who were engaged in the battle and are well satisfied that the whole loss on the part of the patriots does not exceed 30 killed. The British loss must have been a great.

LATE FROM CANADA.

Further particulars of the engagement near Missisquoi Bay.

MARTIAL LAW DECLARED!
We have a ship from the office of the Burlington Sentinel, dated 9th inst., from which we gather the following interesting particulars.

On the authority of a letter from St. Albans, dated on the 7th, it says of the battle near Missisquoi Bay:—

"It appears that a party of patriots, which had been for a few weeks in Swanton, providing themselves with arms and ammunition, attempted to cross the line on the evening of the 6th, under protection of a body of Patriots from the Province. The loyalists who were apprised of the intended movements of the Patriots, assembled in the vicinity of the Bay in a body of about 500, with the intention of intercepting them. They stationed themselves in three divisions upon the roads by which the patriots were expected to march.

About 10 in the evening the patriot party were fired upon by the division of the loyalists stationed upon the road leading by the dwelling of Mr. Morse, 2 miles east of the Bay. The fire was returned with spirit. The engagement lasted about 20 minutes. The Patriots were defeated, and fell back towards Swanton with the loss of two cannon and several killed and missing.

Buchet, the editor of the Quebec Liberal, a talented and spirited Patriot leader was severely wounded and taken prisoner. The proclamation of the Governor we apprehend will not produce any sensible change in the aspect of affairs.

Four thousand dollars have been offered for the arrest of Papineau, on the charge of high treason, and two thousand dollars for Brown. The Franklin Republican states that Lynch law had been threatened to those Americans who afforded protection to the patriots. Families from Canada are flying in consternation

From the Eastern Argus.
AN ADMISSION.

Certain federal papers (after laboring in vain to prove that they are not federal,) have at length set about proving that if they are so, the fact will not operate as a disqualification with that party which would like to be known as "whigs." The Journal of Commerce says "the great body of the 'whigs' are decidedly against all these narrow notions," and to prove its assertion refers to the fact that the true blue, unadulterated Hartford Convention federalists, like David B. Ogden, who were on the "whig" (1) ticket at the late election in New York, received as many votes, as those candidates who have never confessed their federalism, but have been known under other names. This fact proves the Journal's position, & it proves just as conclusively, what we have always asserted, that the old federal party and the modern "whig" party, are one and the same—at any rate, we find one of the leading journals of the latter asserting and proving that to have belonged to the former is no disqualification. A federal paper in this city, the Courier, copies and endorses the Journal's article, and says:—

"It cannot be supposed that to him who has come upon the stage of action since the old federal and democratic party, divided which defunct *by* *its* candidate for office once belonged."

Pray when did the "old divisions become defunct?" Upon the principle that it takes two to make a bargain, they have not yet "become defunct." The federalists have endeavored to shake off their name, but not so the democrats—the latter have, and will continue to stick to old names and old tests. We are not to be inveigled to sea without compass, chart or rudder—we think it better to go by the old soundings, and steer by the old lights. The great questions upon which the country is divided now, involve the same principles with those which divided it years ago, when the federalists were proud of their name, and the democrats, as now, were proud of theirs. Why then should we consent to a change of names?

The Portsmouth Journal, which has been a modern "whig" paper in good standing, advances the same doctrine with the Journal of Commerce. It comes into the ranks of its party, "every man who is tired of experiments," and says:—

"It will not be worth while to enquire whether his grandfather wore a cocked hat or a round one—whether his father voted for Jefferson or Adams, nor whether he himself believed gun-boats to be the best navy, or signed his name to a *Washington Benevolent Society*, and stood up for the Hartford Convention."

Neither of the papers give even an intimation that any change of principles is essential to qualify an advocate of the Hartford Convention. They are content to be known as "whigs" without any evidence of "a change of heart." Why, then, should these self-styled "whigs" object to being called by their true name of federalists?—simply because it has become odious—for the same reason that a rogue fancies an alias. Let those grately the whim of the federalists who will, we will not, and we venture to suggest to our democratic brethren throughout the State, the policy and propriety of adhering to old names and old tests. We are not willing to fellowship, politically, with a Hartford Convention federalist, until he has changed his principles, and sincerely repented of his past deeds—the mis-called "whigs" say they are, and for our own part we see no good reason why they should not be—for them to turn up their noses at federalism, would be like the arms and legs rebelling against the body from which they derive their strength.

From the Eastern Argus.

THE LATE BANK CONVENTION, &c.

The proceedings of the late Bank Convention have given very little satisfaction to the community generally. The feeling is almost universal that it was the duty, and within the power, of that Convention, to have fixed upon a day for resumption. The convention is irresistible that the postponement was a political measure, dictated by Mr. Bidwell, and intended to operate in favor of the Institution over which he presides. It is the determination of the federal leaders, if possible, to stave off the resumption so that the continuance of an irredeemable currency may be brought to bear upon the next elections—let them beware that they do not overstep the mark! Among the people, without distinction of party, there is a feeling that it is the duty of the Banks to resume at an early day in the spring, and that if they do not fulfil that duty they will cease to have a claim to any farther forbearance.

The reader will see by the facts set forth in the following article from the New York Herald of the 8th inst., that the state of the foreign exchanges is such as to enable the banks, (if they have been judiciously conducted,) to resume forthwith—that a National Bank is not necessary to regulate or facilitate exchanges—and that the Philadelphia, Baltimore and Boston Banks oppose a resumption for a "consideration."—"The equalizing movement in the foreign exchanges continued to-day till the very last moment. We are credibly informed that a few parcels went as low as 111, calculating in bank money, which is nearly equivalent to 3 per cent under the real par of exchange between New York and Liverpool. The same process continues in domestic exchanges. To-day exchange on New Orleans was sold for 1-2 to 1-3-4 premium—on Charleston, 1-2—and on Mobile 5. This remarkable fact is now developed of an equalization almost in the

southern exchanges without the aid or intervention of a National Bank. Indeed, it is confidently stated, that if the course of commercial events continue, exchanges between New York and New Orleans will fall to par in a short time—a thing unprecedented and unknown in the commercial history of this country.

Conclusions, from these facts, may be drawn, of great importance to financial science. They prove that the elements of commerce control the exchanges—not the facitious rules of a board of directors or the existence of a national bank. Cotton, and cotton alone, is the principle element of phenomenon. The amount of capital to purchase cotton has been flowing towards the south, while the south has given New York few orders for goods.

But while this continues to be the healthy action of the commercial circle, formed of Liverpool, New York and New Orleans, the state of the exchanges between New York and the neighboring Atlantic cities is unnatural and high. Exchange on Baltimore is 2 per cent—on Philadelphia 1-3-4, on Boston 2 to 2-1-2. This arises from the fact that the balances, due by those three cities to New York, are estimated at \$5,000,000. This *sum* capital to the without *its* mere, while New York is deprived of her just rights. To this circumstance is also to be attributed the opposition to the resumption of specie payments, by Baltimore, Boston and Philadelphia in the Bank Convention. As long as the present state of dishonor continues among the Banks, New York cannot call in her bank balances, nor charge interest. Under our own State suspension law, the western banks agreed to pay 4 to 5 per cent interest for all balances accumulating here after a certain date. This had the effect to keep down those balances—but with Boston, Philadelphia and Baltimore, the suspension leaves us entirely in their power. The motives which influence the refusal of these banks to name a day for resumption, become therefore, very plain and very obvious.

Apropos of the Bank Convention—We perceive that Maine was represented by Ashbur Ware and Joseph C. Noyes, the federal representative in Congress from Hancock and Washington. Were the latter gentleman's credentials called for? Had he any? Judge Ware was the only delegate chosen by the State Convention—Mr. Noyes was there as a political delegate from the U. S. Bank party.—Judge Ware, it is understood, was in favor of fixing on a day for resumption, Mr. Noyes opposed! We do not hesitate to say that the latter was influenced by political considerations alone—he could have had no other reasons, for the Bank with which he is connected at Eastport, and which, it is presumed, he claimed the right to represent, has never suspended specie payments. And yet one of its directors, to answer a political end, voted to fasten upon this emergency. Let his constituents remember this—let them not forget that he went, *an interloper*, into the Bank Convention, and there voted against a resolution requiring those Institutions to pay their debts, to become honest, and that too after the Banks of this State had instructed their only duly elected representative to vote for the earliest practicable day. Let these things be remembered.

The Message is assailed by the opposition press in the city of New York, in terms of wholesale denunciation: Save the Journal of Commerce, it is denounced *in toto*, and without reservation or qualification. If they are to be credited, not a word of it is said, nor a suggestion rightly made. It is denounced, at once, as non-committal, and as committed in the strongest terms—as tame and subdued, and as fierce and uncompromising—as succumbing to the Conservatives, and as imbued with loco-focoism—as "timid, covering and wavering," and as breathing war, and "echoing the coarse calumnies of the Globe."

If any thing can be required to satisfy republicans of the truth and the strong grounds of the Message—and of the sincerity with which the President has presented his views to the consideration of Congress and for the judgment of the people,—it is this indiscriminate and wholesale war upon it and upon him in federal quarters. But the most senseless and ideal of the charges against the Message is that of loco-focoism.—The unscrupulous New York Express exclaims, "Well Martin Van Buren is a loco-foco yet!" and the Albany Daily Advertiser, thinks that "few who have considered Mr. Van Buren's position will be disappointed at the general features of loco-focoism which pervade the Message."

The meaning and scope of "Loco Focoism," in the federal acceptance of the word, we shall take another occasion to illustrate. Meanwhile we do not believe that a single American citizen has risen from the perusal of that document with the belief, or with the remotest thought, that it was imbued with loco-focoism, in any particular or in its "general features." Nor do we believe that the thought would occur to any one, unless it were suggested by sinister malice or partisan hostility. Wherein do the "general features of loco-focoism pervade the message?" Are they to be found in its opening paragraph,—"the renewal of an expression of gratitude to the Giver of all Good for this benighted protection and for the continued dispensations of His favor upon our beloved country? Are they to be found in its well-considered and impartial review of the fortunate condition of our foreign relations—in its succinct statement of the condition of the national finances—in its business notices of the army, the navy, the military academy, and the general post office? Are they to be found in its clear and just recommendations in

relations to the classification and graduation of the prices of the public lands and the protection of the rights of the actual settler? Are they to be found in its calm, moderate and conciliatory view of the question of a disconnection between the banks and the government; in its language of deference for the opinions of others; or in its free submission, under a firm conviction of the soundness of its suggestions, to the national will, as "the supreme law of the republic?" Are they to be found in its disclaimer of hostility to the State banks; or in its exposure of the fraudulent issue by the present Bank of the United States, of the irredeemable notes of a defunct institution, acting in the capacity of trustees, but in violation of every obligation as such, and of every duty to the public and to the government?

But we will not question the intelligence of the people of this country so much as to pursue the interrogatory, or to imagine for a moment that a device so stale and groundless can deceive them, in any degree, or that the patriotic and thinking electors of our republic can be drawn away from a just and rational support of the administration by imputations which so *Albany Argus*.

ON JORD DEMOCRAT.

Paris, December 19, 1837.

The success of the federal party has emboldened them in many instances to an avowal of their sentiments and principles which we reject to see. We reject it because it will have a tendency to raise up the spirit of democracy when they are once convinced that their old foe is in the field—that the federalism of by-gone days is creeping out of the holes and lurking places where it had sought for shelter from the aroused indignation of the people. The election of Mr. Adams to the Presidency was hailed as auspicious to the resurrection of federalism, and one of the leaders of that defeated party proclaimed that those who fell in the first Adams were to rise with the second. But the people caught the alarm and their hopes were crushed. Now in their hour of success and fancied victory some are throwing off the mask and proclaiming their hopes of the restoration of the principles of Adams and Hamilton. The patriot, Jefferson, whom the people have been taught to esteem and admire—and whose reputation is cherished in the hearts of the democracy of the country, is now attacked with the vilest abuse by those who a little year ago dared not to whisper a thought injurious to his character. Some may enquire why the ashes of the dead are thus raked open; why the sanctity of the grave is invaded by political scribbles? The answer is plain. The writings of Jefferson have become a sort of political text book to the democracy of the country, and they have exerted and continue to exert an influence over the minds of the people dangerous if not fatal to the success of federalism. It is perhaps found more convenient or less difficult to attack his character than his positions and arguments. At any rate they appear to think that if his character can be destroyed in the estimation of the people, his principles and precepts will possess less influence. The plan is a bold one but we have no fears of its success. When the opponents of the present administration have written down Jefferson, they will doubtless write up Adams, Hamilton and Amer. When the people have learned to despise the former, they may easily be taught to venerate the principles and doctrines of the latter—but not till then. We are spared further remarks on this subject, by the several able articles which our readers will find in this day's paper, and to which we invite their attention.

Mr. Webster in one of his late speeches declared that there was but one question before the country and that question has but two sides. It follows, then, that there can be but two parties, and each man must belong to one or the other of these parties. That question is Bank or no Bank. We are glad to have that question so precisely put. The people can understand it. We trust that most of them have their minds made up. The time will soon come when we shall be called upon to act—Will you be governed by a National Bank or by such rulers as the people may select? This is a question that you are called upon to decide, not merely for yourselves but for your children, and for posterity. If you sell yourselves and your liberty to a Bank, there can be no redemption but through blood—if you part with the power of self government it cannot be regained except by a revolution. It will never be too late to yield to the aristocracy of wealth. You will always have the means of propitiating that power so long as you retain the administration in your own hands. But if you once yield there will be nothing left to contend for. The issue of a free government may still be kept up because they may be useful to veil the deformity of a despotic—the chains may be guided, but they will not be the less galling. Choose then your side of the question now presented by the friends of a National Bank. The wealth of the country and all which it can influence or control will be on one side. The democracy of the country will be on the other.

It is stated that the elder Adams when pressing upon his relative, the Patriot, Samuel Adams, the necessity of establishing a monarchical government, replied to his enquiry of how he could induce the people to submit to the loss of their liberties, by saying that he would do it by slaughter—by reviling and degrading every man who opposed their measures. This idea appears never to have been lost sight of by his followers. No man since that day has been eminent for his devotion to the cause of the people—no man has dared to maintain the democratic doctrines of the capacity of men for self government—of equal rights and privileges, and a resistance to all irresponsible power, but what the whole federal press has been loud and vehement in its abuse and sniping in their attacks upon his character and reputation. From Jefferson to Van Buren the mode of attack has been the same, and the charges similar if not identical. The principles of democracy are represented as opposed to the order and well being of society—as destructive of national prosperity and happiness. The federalists have always claimed for themselves all the religion and decency, and attempted to slander their opponents as being destitute of both. This mode of attack has not heretofore met with the success which was anticipated for it, but it is still persisted in as though it were the last hope of theocracy. As one of their own politicians has said of them, the federalists are too obstinate to learn anything from past experience, but still go on contending for the exploded doctrines of the darker ages of the world, while the people have been maintaining and enjoying the blessings of freedom and equality. There is, however, something in the scheme above referred to, and its practice has been attended with partial success.

But it can never be completely successful so long as the people are honest and intelligent.

We need not invite the attention of our readers to the President's Message, as we trust that all will peruse it with deep interest. But we do ask for it a careful and attentive consideration. The sentiments it contains and the doctrines it advances are such as will command the entire approbation of every democrat in the country. There is nothing mysterious or perplexing about it. Every one who reads can understand it. The federalists who consider it their duty to find fault with it, appear to be at a loss on what point to attack it. One says it is too decided, another charges it as being too committal. Its views are charged with being arbitrary and dictatorial by one, while another finds it full of loco-focoism, and containing the essence of radicalism. The truth is, that when men are determined to find fault, objections are easily made. All who are honest and capable of judging will allow the message to be able, frank, and dignified. It is to be expected that our opponents should dissent from the doctrines advanced, and endeavor to decri them in the estimation of the people. Were this done in an open and frank manner, in the presence of the people, we have friends have a right and we presume have no disposition to complain. From such a course we have nothing to fear. We must also expect misrepresentation and abuse. For this we presume every democrat is prepared. We are ready to submit to the verdict of the people.

The result of the late Bank Convention the people has not disappointed the expectations of the people generally. They must have been aware long before this that they had nothing to hope from the Bank—that the object of the convention was political and pecuniary, and that these interests alone would influence their deliberations. Such has been the fact. That portion of the convention who were influenced by pecuniary considerations would have been willing to have fixed upon some future day for the resumption of specie payments, but the politicians would not consent to this. They would not consent to forego the advantages which the Bank party in politics might derive from continuing the pressure another year. They feared to relax their grasp upon their victims, lest their indignation for the past might overcome their fears of the future, and that those who now rule with a rod of iron, might find the rod held over their own heads. By this it was supposed that the people had not yet suffered enough, that they were not yet prepared to kiss the rod and own fealty to a national Bank. They found that the object intended by the suspension was not yet fully accomplished—and that the independence of the people was not yet fully subdued, therefore the pressure must be kept on and the rods tightened.

We'll be it so. The remedy is in the hands of the people. They may use it or patiently endure whatever their masters may choose to inflict. We do not pretend to know exactly how much the people are disposed to bear in the way of insult and oppression, nor how far their spirits are subdued to submit to the terms prescribed by these moneyed corporations who are but the creatures of their will. If we were satisfied that a Bank aristocracy was the best form of government, our spirit would still revolt at the means employed to bring it about. Time will show whether the democracy of the country is not of the same opinion.

We find nothing in the Congressional proceedings worthy of particular notice. As yet they have hardly commenced business. Another week we will endeavor to inform our readers what they are about.

READ! PONDER! DECIDE!!

Democracy decide, whether you will ever succumb and cringe like beasts of burden to such modern Whig doctrine—such an anti-republican, privileged, despotic system, as is given in the annexed outlines of their political creed.—North Star

From the Boston Advertiser.

WHIG DOCTRINE!

The exploded doctrine of Hamilton, that the people were their worst enemies is again revived since the whig successes in New York. We are now openly told by the ablest federal writers, that the people are incapable of self-government, that the Constitution gives them too much liberty, that suffrage must be restricted, that the President must hold his office independent of popular will, and the two separate Houses of Congress abolished.

These are the principles of the resuscitated federal party, now openly advocated in the New York Commercial, and declared by that paper to be from the pen of one of the highest heads in the party. It is a fact that a labored essay has appeared in the New York Commercial of Monday last, in which the following monarchical doctrines of the revived federal party are unblushingly maintained, and from which the people may learn what their fate will be if the monarchical party, the modern whigs, ever get the ascendancy.

1. That it is idle to talk of the intelligence of the people, for "the history of nations cannot present an example of such TOTAL WASTE OF INTELLIGENCE as our country now affords."
2. That it is a FUNDAMENTAL MIS-TAKE that the people MAY BE GOVERNED, or will govern themselves by reason."
3. That "the difficulties in our political affairs are the genuine and natural consequences of DEFECTS in the Constitution, and of the FALSE and VISIONARY opinions which Mr. Jefferson and his disciples have been proclaiming for forty years."
4. That universal suffrag has been left without adequate restriction."
5. That high officers should not be responsible to the people, and the Constitution must be changed in this respect, because "when the Executive officers depend for their offices on annual or frequent elections there will be no impartial or efficient administration of the laws."
6. That "the Constitution must SECURE the Chief Magistrate in his office."

These are the whig doctrines of the day, and give that party a National Bank and they will establish just such high tory principles of arbitrary government as these. We are surprised to see the mask off so soon. It was sur-

have been supposed that the "dear people" would have been flattered a little more before they were told they were too ignorant to govern themselves or to be trusted with the election of their rulers.

The exulting New York whigs of the Ogden and Burr school, have avowed their high government doctrine a little to soon. Mr. Webster has just sent a letter to the Boston Whig eating Committee advising them to do every thing possible to flatter the people—to be sure all committees and managers consult the people most respectfully before they do any thing, and then do as they please, in the midst of this complaisance from Mr. Webster out comes the true federal doctrine that the people are not fit to govern themselves!

FROM CANADA.

A co respondent of the New York Express writes from the "North part of Vermont," under the date of Dec. 4, as follows:—

"The Patriots are rapidly organizing, but they are in great want of arms,—they hope to procure them in season for the winter campaign. If the more wealthy of the patriots could raise funds sufficient to purchase five or ten thousand stand of arms, they would easily take possession of all the lower Province, except Quebec, this winter."

From the representations of the writer, the British troops engaged in the operations against St. Dennis and St. Charles, accomplished nothing to boast of.

The Plattsburg Whig of Saturday, Dec. 2, gives an account of the entrance of a royalist Sheriff with three armed men, into the tavern of Mr. Nichols, an American citizen at Champlain. The British officer enquired if certain men of the Canadian Radical party were there, and upon receiving an indirect answer, proposed searching the house. Mr. N. told him he should not search, when the Bailiff threatened to blow out his brains Mr. Nichols dared him to fire—after which the royal party left the house. The circumstance excited a little burlesque of yankee indignation. The Burlington (Vt) Sentinel of the 8th inst., says:—"About 40 Canadian gentlemen who had fled from their families to Swanton across the line for fear of being arrested upon the charge of high treason—thinking after the battle of St. Charles and the Proclamation of the Governor, that they would be safe to return their families, started from Swanton with that view. They were attacked at Missisquoi by about 500 loyalists lying in ambush, who had heard of their determination to return home. They killed one man, wounded two, shot one horse, and took one prisoner. The party of Canadians, we understand, upon being attacked retreated across the line."

The St. Albans Journal says:

The Patriots are organizing their men and preparing for their winter campaign. Little is making will be done till there is a cessation of the snow. The patriots are assembled in large numbers and are drilling under the command of a man by the name of Charnard and a Swiss officer by the name of Good. They have the complete command of the country and have stopped the mails. On this side of the St. Lawrence they have received from St. Dennis and are now posted at St. Cles Bay.

All active operations will gradually be suspended on both sides until the month of January.

Not the least reference can be placed in the accounts of the battle of St. Charles which are published by the Tory paper of Montreal. We have received information from numbers of persons who were engaged in the battle and are well satisfied that the whole loss on the part of the patriots does not exceed 30 killed. The British loss must have been a great.

LATEST FROM CANADA.

Further particulars of the engagement near Missisquoi Bay.

MARTIAL LAW DECLARED!

We have a ship from the office of the Burlington Sentinel, dated last, from which we gather the following interesting particulars. On the authority of a letter from St. Albans, dated on the 7th, it says of the battle near Missisquoi Bay:—

It appears that a party of patriots, which had been for a few weeks in Swanton, providing themselves with arms and ammunition, attempted to cross the line on the evening of the 6th, under protection of a body of Patriots from the Province. The loyalists who were apprised of the intended movements of the Patriots, assembled in the vicinity of the Bay in a body of about 500, with the intention of intercepting them. They stationed themselves in three divisions upon the roads by which the patriots were expected to march.

About 10 in the evening the patriot party were fired upon by the division of the loyalists stationed upon the road leading by the dwelling of Mr. Morse, 2 miles east of the Bay. The fire was returned with spirit. The engagement lasted about 20 minutes. The Patriots were defeated, and fell back towards Swanton, with the loss of two cannon and several killed and missing.

Buchet, the editor of the Quebec Liberal a talented and spirited Patriot leader was severely wounded and taken prisoner.

The proclamation of the Governor we apprehend will not produce any sensible change in the aspect of affairs.

Four thousand dollars have been offered for the arrest of Papineau, on the charge of high treason, and two thousand dollars for Brown.

The Franklin Republican states that Lynch law had been threatened to those Americans who afforded protection to the patriots. Families from Canada are flying in consternation

from the seat among us. The Tories seem resolved to take the first advantage with us.

The Proclamation setting forth that he has "Is Sir John Colborne in the service of Her Majesty and punish all manner assisting Rebellion while the most daring Majesty's Forces in the said District subjects in this notice." We have received 4th, and Montreal Com.

The first day of the election, 31st of December. The number armed and on was limited to last week. The halloos of the has been sent tions of this

AN INFAMOUS MEMORY.

We have now with a more the graph—or on letter and still Portland and Ottawa a year since political neutral in a narrow and calamity G. W. G. is now

"Jaron Barr" through the 2d Barr. We have which every record of this his father, was represented as MORE AT the battle of St. Charles. There express the de set both in the every honest to the name of federalism was not at all the true of no more, he a ter of Jefferson present and from a detailed that was ever of arm. We Harris of important a century.

series of even been looked moment American his station, a spirit, to re history will a Burr, so not con-temn.

re-lecting to into the bibe, BRY, DIA TESTABU catalogue of the worst of We are in any hand in ever strong are willing to for public of the judicious exhortations humanity.

We are in any hand in ever strong are willing to for public of the judicious exhortations humanity.

We are in any hand in ever strong are willing to for public of the judicious exhortations humanity.

We are in any hand in ever strong are willing to for public of the judicious exhortations humanity.

We are in any hand in ever strong are willing to for public of the judicious exhortations humanity.

We are in any hand in ever strong are willing to for public of the judicious exhortations humanity.

We are in any hand in ever strong are willing to for public of the judicious exhortations humanity.

